



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE WASTE IN INTERNATIONAL EFFORT

IF A SURVEY should be made of the money spent by private agencies in international effort, it is probable that it would reveal an enormous waste. In the absence of such a survey, nothing can be proved. Conjecture there is aplenty.

Some of this waste, it seems to us, is due to erroneous thinking. For example, peace societies continue to be born, to live, but to die in their infancy, around the world. They seem to have no abiding foundations. Just now there is a "No-More-War" absolutist international movement, with members pledged never to take part in war, offensive or defensive, international or civil, whether by bearing arms, making or handling munitions, voluntarily subscribing to war loans, or setting others free for war service. We are told that this movement dates its origin back to two German prisoners influenced by the No-Conscription Fellowship movement while interned in English camps. There are evidences that this "No-More-War" movement is spreading around the world. It is very active in England, where supporting it are religionists, laborites, ex-service men, women, and others. The aim of this work, so we are informed, is to establish No-More-War centers for the mobilization of peace opinion in times of crisis, for educational effort, and for a united peace demonstration each summer. It is difficult to put one's finger on the fault in this movement. We are of the opinion that it is more emotional than informed; that it will prove to be more fatuous than successful; that when the crisis actually arises, like the socialist group of Europe at the beginning of the last war, it will simply dissolve in impotence.

In the city of Brussels, housed now in the Palais Cinquantenaire, there is an international library formed by the union of some sixty libraries belonging to various international institutions established at Brussels. There was held a congress of international associations in Brussels in 1910, out of which grew the International Museum, where graphic and statistical tables are exhibited showing the "character, resources, and principal activities of most countries." In the same year was founded the Union of International Associations, a federation open to all organizations, private and public, which are not commercial, but which have an intellectual or moral object in the interest of public service. At the beginning of the war it was reported that 230 international organizations belonged to the union. We are told now that its founders aim to establish an "International University" at Brussels as a center for higher international education; that its first session was held in September, 1920, with an attendance of about one

hundred, and that a second one was held in the summer of 1921. Its promoters are trying to build a "brain for the world." They hope to see the university placed under the auspices of the League of Nations, but so far, says its chief promoter, "stupidity" has interfered. Here again one wonders about the effectiveness of such work. It is difficult to conceive an international institution built on these lines. In the United States, for example, it has been a dream of some since the time of George Washington to set up an international university; but so far the difficulties have been insurmountable. Since 1907 both money and influence have been at work trying to establish an Academy of International Law at The Hague; so far without success. Plans for an international university at Panama have failed. Where national universities exist, even they are having hard sledding. The "international" aspects of education in our colleges and universities of long standing have not yet developed to the point where there can be set up any appreciable demand for an international university, in Belgium or elsewhere. What an international university could accomplish that universities already organized cannot achieve does not appear. Again, we fear that the effort in Brussels is misdirected and probably wasteful.

The peace societies, even the old-line and established ones, are not immune from criticism in this respect. Dr. Franz Ritter, writing in *Die Wage* of Vienna under date of March 11, takes up the cudgel with no uncertain swing. The article is worth reading in its entirety:

It has an impressive effect when men who have made gigantic fortunes from reckless exploitation or from manufacture of murderous weapons finally dedicate enormous sums to the object of organizing the war against war and of creating a juster world order. Even the greatest opponents of capitalism will have to recognize the idealism and the tragedy lying in such a condemnation of their own life's work. But the tragedy is followed by a grotesque satire as soon as the great desire is transformed into action. Thus Cecil Rhodes left behind his riches in order to realize international brotherhood through a great plan for the education of youth. Nobel, the inventor of dynamite, set apart his millions to the end of paving the way to world peace, and the steel magnate, Carnegie, sought to attain the same object by means of an enormous endowment.

What has become of all these dreams? Undoubtedly much good has been wrought, but how far does it remain behind the most modest expectations? A newspaper article gives us occasion to consider the working methods of the Carnegie Endowment. Even before the war the experts answered questions with a shrug of their shoulders: "Those people do not know what to do with all that money." Then it was reported that the Carnegie Endowment was getting out exceedingly luxurious editions of old works in which nobody on earth has any interest. When a German professor who was requested to re-edit an old work on international law replied that this could be done with less expense, he was

told: "We have a given amount of money for this purpose and we must expend it." The same was true in the field of political economy. A few professors received salaries and in return had their students write utterly insignificant and worthless seminar papers having nothing at all to do with the conception of peace. This occurred at a time when Germany was flooded with Pan-German propaganda and was being stirred up to a spirit of war. The German pacifists looked helplessly on, for they lacked even the most modest financial means for taking up the battle with the Pan-German war instigators, who were in the employ of the big business interests.

Now the Carnegie Endowment has hit upon a still more grandiose plan. From a notice in the Vienna press we learn that a monumental work dealing with the economic history of the war is to appear, for the publication of which a committee of prominent economists has been formed in every country. Ten volumes are to be devoted to Austria-Hungary alone. It may therefore be assumed that the entire work will have approximately the scope of the Chinese Encyclopedia, which is to be admired in the British Museum. But we believe that even this Chinese Encyclopedia will contain much more wisdom than the history of the follies and crimes committed during the World War. Yes, after all, the history of human folly has a certain value, and political economists would probably be grateful to the Carnegie Endowment if approximately one volume on the economic history of the war should appear for each country, although, especially in Germany, the most important chapters have long since been subjected to exhaustive treatment, so that an urgent need for a new treatment of the subject is hardly felt. But ten volumes for Austria-Hungary alone!

Would it not be much more instructive if the Carnegie Endowment would cause a study to be made of the economic disruptions which Wilson brought about in Europe? It would also be desirable if the grandiose philanthropic work of the Americans in the famine regions of Europe were described—work which has mitigated the effects of the Wilsonian policy to some extent. Such a description would at least contribute to the dissemination of friendly feelings among the nations.

But our surprise must increase when we read who is to be in charge of this gigantic work. Undoubtedly some of the names that are mentioned are good. But does it conform to the aims of Carnegie when such decidedly Pan-German war instigators as Mr. Richard Riedl and General Krauss are called upon to lend their co-operation? We do not know who belongs to the German board, but to judge by the above we confidently expect that the Endowment will publish also contributions from the pen of Ludendorff and Stresemann. The name of Dr. Gustav Gratz also has a pleasant ring. As is well known, Dr. Gratz is the soul of all attempts at monarchical restoration. It is to be regretted that the names of most of the collaborators are passed over in modest silence. However, the *Wiener Tageszeitung*, to which we owe this information, says that in general the official authorities preponderate who were actively engaged in the economic activities incident to the war, and that a number of intendants, many ministerial officials, etc., will contribute.

This is the last straw! How relieved we felt when we hoped to be rid of this whole crew after the revolution. To be sure, we could not foresee that they would be preserved to

us as liquidating organs. But now, to cap the climax, they are to be permitted, at the expense of the fund which Carnegie dedicated for the war against war, to glorify their beneficent activity in the conflict which ended with the destruction of the economic fabric of Austria. Even the unquestionably conservative *Neues Wiener Tageblatt* has scruples, and it writes: "The only question is whether, in view of this distribution of work, the description of the purposes and measures used will play too prominent a rôle, while the representation of the failures, the unfavorable practical effects, and the development of public opinion up to the revolution will, perhaps, be slighted.

It is only to be regretted that this monumental work will, as it seems, contain no illustrations; otherwise we would recommend that the portraits of all those heroes of the Hinterland be preserved who took so glorious and honorable a part in the destruction of the moral and economic forces of the Austrian people. It would be a veritable democratic hall of fame which would have to include the assiduous petty officer of accounts, as well as the jobbing archduke and general. A special volume containing portraits of our most important war profiteers would also be charming.

The accredited peace movement has become discredited, for a variety of reasons; but discredited it is. One of the reasons is the tendency to fashion and to promote programs based upon insufficient knowledge of the facts. Where the work is sanely buttressed and mixed with brains, it meets with support and achievement. In too many instances, for the want of an informed sanity, the effort in behalf of world peace is misdirected and wasteful. Even so, it is not all loss. The supreme need of needs, reform of reforms, is the substitution of the bright ways of justice for the black deeds of war. The collective judgments of foreseeing men and women will yet bring the constructive peace movement into its own again.

RELIGION neither blushes nor veils her sacred fires. In our own country the Moody Bible School of Chicago and the Torrey Institute of Los Angeles are trying to bring literalism to life again, to rehabilitate Milton's Satan, to scare us once more with the bogey of an ended world and the assurance of a second coming of Christ, an anthropomorphic heaven, and the fires of an everlasting hell. In the meantime the Conan Doyles are telling us of their communications with the spirits of the hereafter with an assurance that convinces some. But the strangest and perhaps the most fundamental recrudescence of mysticism is coming to us out of India. Ram-Prasad-Dube of India, writing in *Clarté*, Paris, assures us that no movement has swept India since the days of Gautama Buddha, with his message of love and equality among men, like that now agitating the people in Britain's long docile possession of the Far East. Buddha and Gandhi differ, he points out, in that Buddha sought the overthrow of the priestly and military castes,

while the Gandhi movement is political and economic. The basic causes of Gandhi's success, he holds, are found in England's domination, her economic and political exploitation, plus the social humiliation of India's population. British capital, he says, has drained the wealth of that rich land, with the result that the Hindus are chronically undernourished and their social and intellectual development systematically stunted. The revolt, he thinks, will be felt for all time to come, although its immediate purpose is only temporary. One wonders how far brains and religion can be mixed.

HATE, one of the foul offsprings of war, dies hard. The picayunish quality of this beast is not the least loathsome of its attributes. In spite of constitutional restrictions, Germany is teaching her children by means of moving pictures of the lands stolen from her by her enemies. Instruction in the schools of France is designed to keep alive the bitterness engendered by the war. Now we are told that the Paris municipal authorities, over three years following the signing of the armistice, celebrated the sixth anniversary of the Battle of Verdun. One of the features of the celebration was the announcement that the city fathers had decided to change the name of one of the streets, the Rue de Ham-bourg, to Rue de Bucarest, "because the people living there suffer under the indignity of receiving mail addressed to a street named after a German city."

THE GENOA CONFERENCE has accomplished an unexpected thing. The American administration is more clearly convinced than formerly that Europe's financial difficulties will not be settled so much through governmental agencies as by private persons, experts in their respective lines. The President has indicated that he has no objection to J. P. Morgan sitting with the Finance Committee of the Allies Reparations Committee nor to an official of the Federal Reserve banks participating in a conference of the great banks of issue of the world. The Finance Committee and the World Bank Meeting are to be under the direction of the Bank of England. Thus semi-official persons, competent to their tasks, are to address themselves to matters too great for the politicians gathered at Genoa. This is a hopeful sign. It is not the function of government to run the business of the world. Production and transportation are matters primarily of private initiative and concern. It is an expression of sanity that private persons are going about the business of straightening out the private enterprises. If there is to be an international loan for the credit of Germany, let the bankers arrange it. We are in agreement with Secretary Hoover that the great banks of issue are the guardians of stability in

currencies. It stands to reason that our banker friends will do well to conduct their operations with the advice and consent of our Department of State.

ONE FEAR of the Washington Conference seems now to have been justified, namely, that the naval treaty would be used as a plea for a maximum navy under the terms of the treaty. Undoubtedly Secretary Hughes is right in saying that—

"From whatever point of view it is considered, the question of appropriate naval strength is a relative one. It was recognized in calling the recent conference that the only sound basis for effecting a reduction in naval armament was through an agreement among the naval powers which would fix suitable limitations for their respective navies in relation to each other."

But we do not follow the Secretary when he goes on to say:

"The ratification of the conference treaties is important, but it is no less important that the policy which they defined should be adhered to. By agreement of the naval powers, construction programs were virtually abandoned and limitations were fixed. It would be truly extraordinary and a manifest reflection upon the work of the conference if the navy of the United States were reduced below the standard thus established."

It strikes us that the last sentence is distinctly *non sequitur*. It seems to us an unwarranted twist of the facts to interpret the naval treaty to mean that every nation must keep its navy up to the limitation agreed upon. Mr. Hughes goes on to express his own personal opinion, to which, of course, he is entitled, that "to alter that relation would be a very serious matter for the United States, both impairing its prestige and putting its security in jeopardy." This is simply a reaffirmation of the ancient fallacy that "might makes right," and that prestige is measured in terms of brute force. It is a peculiar perversion of horse sense that France, Italy, Japan, and Great Britain would feel grieved should we decide to lessen our naval strength. America ought to be curious to know, and we are all entitled to know, upon what grounds Mr. Hughes places his charge that "to cut under the agreement itself would be likely to prove, I believe, an expensive experiment." It seems to us that Representative Garret, of Tennessee, states the truth when he says that "all that was binding in the agreement was that we should not go above the 5-5-3 ratio. We are not bound morally or legally to keep to that point if we think it wise to reduce." In the absence of more explicit information, we may refuse to be afraid of the "expensive experiment" held over the heads of Congressmen; but, more explicitly, we may well challenge the theory that we have bound ourselves to maintain a navy larger than we want because of our obligations under the naval treaty.